

RE: Action Items - critical and non-critical analytes



Jeanne Briskin to: Stephanie Timmermeyer

02/03/2012 02:17 PM

Ann Campbell, Bob Sussman, Donald Maddox, John Satterfield, Paul Hagemeier, Ramona Trovato, Fred Hauchman, Michael Overbay

Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US From:

To: Stephanie Timmermeyer < stephanie.timmermeyer@chk.com>

Cc: Ann Campbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Donald

Maddox/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Satterfield <john.satterfield@chk.com>, Paul Hagemeier

<paul.hagemeier@chk.com>, Ramona Trovato/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Fred

Stephanie.

Here is the information regarding the definitions of critical and non-critical analytes:

We identify project objectives as either primary or secondary. Primary objectives are those that are critical to meeting the goals of the research activity. Secondary objectives are ancillary to the primary objectives and often provide additional information that supports the primary objective. Associated measurements must then be classified as either critical for primary objectives or non-critical for secondary objectives. This allows a better focus for the planned QA activities (e.g., audits). This means that each analyte (and associated method) will be designated as critical or non-critical. Where we are using methods that are under development, we designate the analytes as non-critical, and their methods as non-critical.

Jeanne

Jeanne Briskin Office of Science Policy Office of Research and Development U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (8104R) Washington, D.C. 20460 (202) 564-4583 - office (202) 565-2911 - fax briskin.jeanne@epa.gov

Address for Deliveries: **US EPA** Ronald Reagan Building -- Room 51144 Washington DC 20004

Stephanie Timmermeyer Jeanne: Thank you for your email. As we... 02/03/2012 02:13:34 PM

From: Stephanie Timmermeyer < stephanie.timmermeyer@chk.com>

Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA To:

Ann Campbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Donald Cc:

Maddox/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Satterfield < john.satterfield@chk.com>, Paul Hagemeier

<paul.hagemeier@chk.com>, Ramona Trovato/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Fred

Hauchman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 02/03/2012 02:13 PM Subject: RE: Action Items

Jeanne:

Thank you for your email. As we just discussed on the phone, 2-4pm EST on Tuesday will work for John Satterfield and I to attend a meeting in DC at your offices. Please send any instructions about contact name and room number at your convenience.

Stephanie

From: Jeanne Briskin [mailto:Briskin.Jeanne@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 9:04 PM

To: Stephanie Timmermeyer

Cc: Ann Campbell; Bob Sussman; Donald Maddox; John Satterfield; Paul Hagemeier; Ramona Trovato;

Fred Hauchman

Subject: Re: Action Items

Hi Stephanie,

Thank you for the information you sent about John's recollection of the criteria we (EPA) feel are important for selecting a new site. Your summary is generally consistent with our thoughts. The attached file shows our criteria extracted from the study plan, with our thoughts on their relative priorities. As you'll see, we have only a few urgent Criteria. These are relatively simple. The remaining criteria are not mandatory but simply useful information to consider to the extent we are able. We envision a straightforward look at potential sites keeping the criteria in mind in order to rapidly identify good candidates and identify a mutually agreeable location.

(See attached file: Site Selection Criteria 020212.docx)

I am also attaching a file with an idealized project timeline for the new site.

(See attached file: Gantt Chart timeline020212.xlsx)

The timeline is not a complete identification of every step we need to take, but we think all the major tasks are there, and the remaining details can be accomplished without significant delays. One exception may be the possible need to obtain state permits for monitoring wells if we move the project out of Louisiana. We have not checked with other states on their requirements yet. Although our schedule is still extremely tight (even without the permitting issue), we think it is acheiveable if we work together.

Regarding the list of potential new shale areas you provided, we are quickly reviewing available information so that we can provide you more feedback. However, the Utica Shale is located in the Appalachian Basin, and our study already has significant efforts in that general area. Consistent with our goal in the study plan of selecting sites that provide geographic and geologic diversity, we prefer a site west of the Mississippi River, as is the case with the other areas you provided. Could you please tell us the approximate depth associated with the wells you would drill in these areas?

As you noted in your email, we still need to resolve a number of outstanding issues, and we look forward to moving ahead with that process. I feel confident that we will be able to achieve consensus on the questions currently before us.

We can all agree the need to stay on schedule is critical to achieving our mutual goals. We think the establishment of a conflict resolution process is a critical component to the success of this project. While we both expect our

respective team members to make this project work, any unresolved issues should be quickly elevated to our senior managers for a decision in order to minimize any project delays.

You had asked about the glycol method. We are adapting ASTM method D7731-11. The method was developed for dipropylene glycol monobutyl ether (DPGBE) and ethylene glycol monobutyl ether in seawater by direct injection using liquid chromotography (LC) and detection with tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS). We are adapting it to measure these and additional glycol ethers in drinking water and groundwater matrices.

The additional information from the action list will be forthcoming.

We are available to meet next Tuesday, February 7. We propose that we use the meeting to get as far down the road to site selection as we can, with a goal of coming to closure on the site in the next two weeks. This will allow us to move on to the next phases, which need to be started immediately. Let us know times that would work for you and we will set up a meeting.

Thanks again for the information you provided. We look forward to our next discussions.

Jeanne

Jeanne Briskin
Office of Science Policy
Office of Research and Development
US EPA
202-564-4583

-----Stephanie Timmermeyer < stephanie.timmermeyer@chk.com wrote: -----

To: Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ramona Trovato/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

 $From: \ Stephanie \ Timmermeyer < \underline{stephanie.timmermeyer@chk.com} >$

Date: 02/01/2012 02:01PM

Cc: Bob Sussman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Donald Maddox/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ann Campbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Paul Hagemeier campbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Paul Hagemeier campbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Paul Hagemeiercampbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Paul HagemeierCampbell/DC/USEPA/US@EPA/

Satterfield < john.satterfield@chk.com>

Subject: Action Items Jeanne and Ramona:

Attached is a list of action items we prepared – please feel free to add or revise items from your notes. Also – I am resending the schedule the we prepared for the HF Work Team. While it is clearly out of date at this point, it is a good estimation on timing for drilling, completions, and other activities on our sites.

In order to facilitate selection of a new site, we still need to understand EPA's site criteria. In speaking with John after the call yesterday, he very quickly listed these site criteria from the EPA HF Team:

- 1. Rural area (less opportunity for anthropogenic activities to impact drinking water resources)
- 2. Large contiguous surface land holding (fewer agreements for monitoring wells/access)
- 3. Low historical oil and gas activity in the area
- 4. Consideration for depths/thicknesses of drinking water aquifer(s) for costs associated with monitoring well installation and sampling
- 5. Low HF activity in the area

We understand now that you may be requesting that "no construction activity" be a site criterion. Additionally, because EPA recently asked for microseismic in the vicinity of the Haynesville proposed site, we assume that having that data in some proximity is also a part of site criteria. In any case, please feel free to add to or revise our understanding of EPA's site criteria. The quicker we have that information, the quicker we can respond to you with potential sites. We would primarily be attempting to locate sites in the following plays, once we have EPA's site criteria in hand:

Mississippi Lime Utica Eagle Ford Colony Wash

We are available to travel to DC Tuesday February 7, to discuss selection of a new site and to work toward resolution on the other issues listed in the attached update. Please let us know if you could meet that day.

Thank you, Stephanie R. Timmermeyer Director - Federal Regulatory Affairs Chesapeake Energy Corporation Mobile: (304) 941-9879

E-mail: Stephanie.Timmermeyer@chk.com

This email (and attachments if any) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email and destroy all copies of the email (and attachments if any).

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	ATTACHMENT	NOT	DELIVERED

This Email message contained an attachment named Schedule.pdf

which may be a computer program. This attached computer program could

contain a computer virus which could cause harm to EPA's computers,

network, and data. The attachment has been deleted.

This was done to limit the distribution of computer viruses introduced

into the EPA network. EPA is deleting all computer program attachments

sent from the Internet into the agency via Email.

If the message sender is known and the attachment was legitimate, you

should contact the sender and request that they rename the file name

extension and resend the Email with the renamed attachment.

receiving the revised Email, containing the renamed attachment, you can

rename the file extension to its correct name.

For further information, please contact the EPA Call Center at (866) 411-4EPA (4372). The TDD number is (866) 489-4900.

*******	ATTACHMENT	TOM	DELIVERED

[attachment "HF Study Action Items 1-30.pdf" removed by Jeanne Briskin/DC/USEPA/US]

This email (and attachments if any) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email and destroy all copies of the email (and attachments if any).